

From: [Craig Cooper](#)
To: [David Cooper](#)
Cc: [Luis Garcia-Bakarich](#)
Subject: Fw: tasc program
Date: 05/21/2009 02:44 PM

David - Here is Christina's email on TASC. Please forward to Terri at E-Squared. I assume that Terri should know that this email is for us to review only. Craig

=====

Craig Cooper
 Superfund Project Manager
 U.S. EPA Region 9
 (415) 947-4148 (ph)
 (415) 947-3520 (fax)

----- Forwarded by Craig Cooper/R9/USEPA/US on 05/21/2009 02:42 PM -----

From: Christina Walsh <cwalsh@cleanuprocketdyne.org>
To: Luis Garcia-Bakarich/R9/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Craig Cooper/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, william bowling <williamprestonbowling@yahoo.com>, David Cooper/R9/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 01/22/2009 04:55 PM
Subject: Re: tasc program

Thanks for your quick response, and I appreciate the opportunity. Following are some areas that I am interested in exploring under this program:

1. Geology expertise to understand specifically the chemical vs. radiological differences between the geology determined to be under the site, i.e. Chatsworth and Santa Susana and the surrounding geological formations that might be similar in makeup, i.e. Chico and Tuna Canyon formations with specific attention to the difference at depth vs. surface samples so that we may have a better understanding on how the global nuclear impacts might differ from those found at the SSFL.

2. Historical Document review: Currently DTSC has a small very good team reviewing the documents, but they are truly monumental in size (the documents). It would be helpful to have independent review of all Area IV historical operational and incident records as well as products used so that we can narrow the list of radionuclides expected, based on site history, vs. primordial or global impact releases. Part of this needs to emphasize an educational aspect to help the everyday people who live around the site, gain a better understanding of the issues and debates currently on the table, so that they may weigh in to the decisions that will possibly impact their futures. In addition, this will help tremendously since the comment periods are usually just 30 days and the documents are thousands of pages of technical data.

3. Groundwater impacts are profound and not well understood. Many of the experts who have proposed that nothing is moving off the site, have never been to the site. We would very much appreciate the opportunity to have those experts as well as an independent review of their data so that the migration of the groundwater plume that sits below the site, can be understood and dealt with.

4. Groundwater options on remediation - a presentation of current, best of science approaches to VOC as well as tritium contaminated groundwater so that those options can be understood on an unbiased

level, enabling the public to substantively comment on this process that they otherwise do not know much about.

5. Expert Interpretation on the previous SSFL Panel Studies so that the epidemiological studies done on the surrounding communities and options presented on other epidemiological and health risk assessment data can be better understood. A gap analysis on the community health risk assessments done to date so that the public can gain from that information on an independent level.

6. CERCLA training if you will. In independent review and presentation of the differences between the formerly followed RCRA process and the CERCLA process for feasibility studies and how those will progress

7. MARSSIM presentation to better understand the MARSSIM process and how it is normally applied after the fact, as a confirmation process, vs. how we are using it here as a clean-up protocol.

8. Background studies and how they are used in other areas. Understanding the differences between the McLaren Hart study vs. the process we are currently following, and how we hope to gain more from this new process.

9. Understanding the differences in the various sampling approaches for various radionuclides such as Cs137 and Strontium 90 and how we will find the other radionuclides that may be alpha emitters when we are doing a gamma survey. Understanding the differences in depth sampling and statical approaches to the analysis and how they might vary. We will be presented with a process, and it would be nice to understand how "universal" that process is vs. how things are done, or have been done in other sites, such as Hanford, Rocky Flats where the topography and process might differ but some of the challenges are the same. What are those differences, and how can we learn from them?

10. Understanding safety practices of today, vs. "back in the day". We have concerns about the current workers and how the hazardous materials will be transported and what those precautions are and should be. Some feel that the impacts are from movement of soil, so that is important to address.

11. What are some possible ways for reducing the time schedule so that the survey can be completed sooner than 2012 so that the overall schedule can be met. What are some time-effective processes that we might change, or re-examine so that we reduce the time that people are exposed the material? Sampling, does it have to be iterative? or can it be done and stored adequately to meet the needs?

Anyway those are just some initial thoughts for you. Please let me know if these issues are within the guidelines of what you feel you can help us with.

Thanks again for the opportunity to learn more about the process and the SSFL!

Christina Walsh
cleanuprocketdyne.org and acmela.org
ACME Aerospace Cancer Museum of Education
8189225123 or museum 8187126903

On Jan 22, 2009, at 3:27 PM, Garcia-Bakarich.Luis@epamail.epa.gov wrote:

```
> Hi Christina,  
>  
> Thank you for expressing your interest in the TASC program. To help  
> scope a work plan with our contractors, I would like it if you could  
> relate to me areas that you would like for the technical experts to  
> focus on; this could include, but is not limited to, the background  
> sampling plan, environmental and human health effects of radiological  
> materials/releases, documents to review, etc.  
>  
> Sincerely,  
>  
> Luis  
>  
> ^-`.,.,.,.>((((°>.-`.,.,.,.>((((°>.-`.,.,.,.>((((°>.-`.,.,.,.
```

